Present: Chairman Thomas LaPerch; Vice Chairman David Rush; Boardmembers Jim King, Eric Cyprus; Dan Armstrong, Lynne Eckardt; Town Attorney Willis Stephens; Town Planner Ashley Ley; Secretary Victoria Desidero. Absent & Excused: Boardmember Michael Hecht

THIS MEETING WAS HELD VIA INTERNET VIDEO CONFERENCING

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you all for joining us in the time of crisis and we will try to do the best we can to get through this meeting with one person speaking at a time and I apologize but my computer does not have my camera working but hopefully you all can hear me. The first thing I would like to do is a roll call for the board members starting with Mr. King: are you present?

Boardmember King: Yes sir.

Chairman LaPerch: Mr. Hecht, are you present? Ms. Eckardt?

Boardmember Eckhardt: I am.

Chairman LaPerch: Welcome. Mr. Armstrong are you present?

Boardmember Armstrong: Yes, I am. **Chairman LaPerch:** Mr. Cyprus? **Boardmember Cyprus:** I am here sir. **Chairman LaPerch:** Thank you; Mr. Rush?

Boardmember Rush: Yes.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, Mr. LaPerch is here. Before I get the meeting going, I'd first like to acknowledge the passing of Jack Gress, a former Planning Board member and a longtime Town of Southeast all around good guy. He passed the other day and our thoughts and prayers go out to his family and we appreciate his long-time service to the community in a very big way. So, I just want to acknowledge Jack as a former member and a big-time player in the Town and Village so our prayers to Jack. Without further ado I'd like to get to the first item is a Public Hearing: Northwood Tree Care. This is an application where we will Continue the Public Hearing to April 27, 2020.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. NORTHWOOD TREE CARE, 25 Fields Lane and 465 North Salem Road, Tax Map IDs 72.-2-73 & 71 –

This is a Continued Public Hearing to Review an Application for Site Plan, Special Use Permit and Conditional Use Permit. The motion to Continue the Public Hearing to April 27, 2020 was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember King and passed all in favor.

Boardmember Cyprus: Someone has a lot of background noise if they can mute.

Chairman LaPerch: Did you hear that request? There's a background noise that someone is coming in with so if you could please help us out, thank you.

REGULAR SESSION:

1. HENRY TREE SERVICE, 47 Prospect Hill Road, Tax Map ID 56.15-1-6 – Review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment. Kathleen Gallagher of InSite Engineering Surveying and Landscape Architecture represented the applicant.

Chairman LaPerch: Ms. Ley, can you walk us through this please? **Ms. Ley:** Sure, let me just... I need to open up a new screen to share.

Chairman LaPerch: Take your time.

Ms. Ley: OK, everyone should be able to see the site plan for Henry Tree Service. Can everyone see it?

Chairman LaPerch: Yes.

Ms. Lev: OK, Kathleen Gallagher is on the line to discuss. This Site Plan that was sent on Friday. It highlights the changes between the plan that was approved by the Planning Board a few years ago and is under construction and what's currently being proposed. So, Kathleen you want to jump in? Ms. Gallagher: Absolutely. Good evening, my name is Kathleen Gallagher and I'm with Insite Engineering Surveying and Landscape Architecture. I'm here on behalf of the applicant, Bill Henry Tree Service. Bill Henry Tree Service is located at 47 Prospect Hill Road. To orient everyone. north is facing up and Prospect Hill Road is on the north side of the property. To review the history of the project, the applicant received a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for the 5.6-acre site to construct a 55 ft. x 65 ft. contractor's building. You can see that kind of in the center of the property and a 55 ft. by 65 ft. canopy with outdoor storage beneath and associated parking on March 13, 2017. The applicant since acquired a Building Permit as well as the 911 address for the additional building, which is 45 Prospect Hill Road and the project is currently under construction. Tonight we're here for an application for Amended Site Plan Approval. As part of the application, the applicant is requesting the following changes and to help point everything out I have numbered the plan. I know the yellow isn't as clear, but hopefully the numbers are large enough that you can follow along. Area 1 is an addition of a sign with the company name and information located at the entrance of the property. Area 2 is the gate and piers at the entrance to the location. Area 3 is the previous outdoor storage area that has been relocated to area 6. Area 4, in order to keep the limit of disturbance as well as deal with the grade changes in that area, the applicant is proposing a low barrier wall. Area 5, to keep the limit of disturbance in the same general magnitude some of the dimensions have been reduced in order to accommodate that so that area has been less in width. Area 6 is the proposal of outdoor storage. There's a woodburning stove in the left-hand corner back area as well as a metal storage shed. The applicant is proposing a metal shed with a roof that extends over the wood burner to the north. The purpose is the building is to be used for a dry kiln in order to kill insects and dry out wood in that area. The project continues to be in compliance with the local Zoning Code. The area of disturbance increased from 0.96 acres to 0.98 acres, which remains under the 1 acreage. The outdoor storage coverage has increased from 9 to 10% but it's still significantly less than the maximum of 25% allowed per Code. There are no proposed changes to the building or the canopy size or configuration. We're here tonight, the applicant understands that a review from the Architectural Review Board may be required. We have submitted a Sign Application to the Building Department in order to receive approval from their department and a referral to the Architectural Review Board. This concludes the technical review of the changes. I'm happy to answer any questions from the consultants.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you, thank you for the presentation. I had a quick question: I've been out to the site a couple of times; the only concern I have is on the lower end where the bins are, is there proposed landscaping along the lower terrace there to kind of hide those bins?

Ms. Gallagher: There is not at this time but that is something that we can incorporate.

Chairman LaPerch: I know you have neighbor is only the MTA but it still looks pretty horrible with just open bins so I would like to see something maybe suggested along the bottom there. Ashley, is that something the ARB has or something we can do?

Ms. Ley: You can request additional screening that would be reviewed by the ARB as well but the Planning Board can ask for additional screening.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, other than that I think you're doing a good job. First of all Lynne, welcome back. I'm glad you're joining us for this meeting. Do you have any questions? **Boardmember Eckardt:** Thank you. I really agree this should go to the ARB and I think the landscaping they should get to review. I appreciate the changes. Other than that I have no questions or suggestions.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you. Mr. King any questions?

Boardmember King: I have no questions at all.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you sir. Mr. Armstrong, any questions? **Boardmember Armstrong:** No, I don't have anything, nothing.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you sir. Mr. Cyprus?

Boardmember Cyprus: No sir.

Boardmember LaPerch: Thank you, Mr. Rush? **Boardmember Rush:** I'm fine... ARB yes.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you sir. So, I have no further questions so we have a couple actions

here.

The motion to Classify this application as a Type II Action and a Minor Project was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Rush and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. **Chairman LaPerch:** Since this neighborhood is mostly the MTA, I have no problem waiving the Public Hearing. Do I have any comment from the Board at this time to my suggestion? The motion to Waive the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember King and passed all in favor. The motion to Refer the Application to the ARB was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Eckardt and passed all in favor.

2. CLASSIC M&J PROPERTIES, INC., 4 Sodom Lane South, Tax Map ID 68.5-2-13 – Review of an Application for Special Permit. Martin McCaffrey is the applicant.

Chairman LaPerch: Welcome and thank you for joining us tonight. What do you have for us?

Mr. McCaffrey: I'm requesting a Special Permit for my building. It's an architectural

woodworker who is on the first floor at the street level.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, this is a home-based business then? **Mr., McCaffrey:** Not home-based, no it's a commercial building.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, so you're renting space. How many employees do you have?

Mr. McCaffrey: It's not my business. I'm renting out the space. He has between two and three people working there.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, and so do you have enough parking for all your tenants?

Mr. McCaffrey: Yes.

Chairman LaPerch: Ashley, does he comply? **Ms. Ley:** Yes, he meets the Zoning requirements.

Chairman LaPerch: OK. Ms. Eckardt, do you have any questions regarding this application

please?

Ms. Eckardt: As long as the parking is adequate I do not, thank you.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you. Mr. King, any questions?

Boardmember King: No questions.

Chairman LaPerch: Mr. Armstrong, any questions?

Boardmember Armstrong: Yes, did I hear you say that you make molding primarily? You don't

build furniture or anything like that?

Mr. McCaffrey: Yes, he builds tables. Right now he is building a front door for a house. He meets with a lot of architects and he does specialty projects like bookcases.

Boardmember Armstrong: The material that you're using to build, is it stored inside or outside? **Mr. McCaffrey:** All the material he uses, he buys on demand as he needs it and brings it in and uses it as he brings it in.

Boardmember Armstrong: OK, do you work there at night or is this a daytime business?

Mr. McCaffrey: His general hours are from 8 to 4 or 5. **Boardmember Armstrong:** OK, that's it, thank you.

Chairman LaPerch: Good Dan thanks, those were good questions, very good questions. Mr.

Cyprus, any questions?

Boardmember Cyprus: Nothing else.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you sir. Mr. Rush?

Boardmember Rush: No questions. There is no modification to the lighting on the outside, right?

Mr. McCaffrey: Correct.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, no further questions at this point from the Board? OK. I have five

actions I'd like to move through here.

The motion to Classify this application as a Type II and a Minor Project was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Rush and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. The motion to refer this application to County Planning on a GML239m was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed all in favor.

Chairman LaPerch: Discussion before the next action which is a Public Hearing. Everything seems self-contained and it's not bringing anything outside or storing anything outside so I have no problem waiving the Public Hearing. Is there any Board comment at this point? **Boardmember Armstrong:** I have no problem with waiving the Public Hearing.

The motion to Waive the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember King and passed all in favor.

Chairman LaPerch: For the next one we will have a discussion. Since there is nothing to be done on the outside architecturally, I don't see a reason to refer this to the ARB. Any comments from the Board please.

Boardmember Eckardt: I don't know... I'm sorry I'm only familiar with the building from pictures. Is there any improvements that anyone sees that could be made or while we have the chance that we find the leverage?

Chairman LaPerch: That's a fair question. Can you scroll back to the visual of the building? **Ms. Ley:** Yes, I can. It is a pretty simple building. Can everyone see the side or is it covered? **Chairman LaPerch:** Yes, I see it. I don't even see any grass or anything.

Boardmember Eckardt: It would be nice to have plantings in front but I don't see any way without tearing up the (inaudible).

Chairman LaPerch: That was a good point Lynne, that was a good pick up in terms of taking the opportunity to see if we can freshen it up, but there is nothing there that I think we can suggest. By the way, I just got a suggestion that if you are not speaking it was suggested you mute your speaker, we would appreciate it as we are hearing a little bit of feedback here.

The motion to Waive the Referral to the Architectural Review Board was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember King and passed all in favor. The motion to Refer to the Town Board for a Special Permit was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent.

Chairman LaPerch: Victoria, when is the earliest this gentleman can get on with the Town Board?

Secretary Desidero: In these times, that's a really good question. I think that Martin should just call Supervisor Hay.

Town Attorney Willis Stephens: The next Town Board meeting is April 9,

Ms. Desidero: I'm not sure how much time they need.

Chairman LaPerch: Martin, call Supervisor Hay to see about getting on the agenda.

Mr. McCaffery: OK, I will do that.

3. NYSEG LINE 803 REBUILD – Review of an Application for Wetland Permit. Michael

Kopansky, Scott Reinhart and Gideon Oppong-Darko represented the applicant.

Chairman LaPerch: Who do we have tonight?

Mr. Kopansky: I believe we have Gideon and Scott Reinhart on the line as NYSEG

representatives as well.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, so what do we have here? An upgrade of your lines coming down from

Kent's

Mr. Kopansky: Correct. NYSEG is proposing an approximately 3-mile rebuild of line 803, which is a 46kv transmission line from Kent Substation to Tilly Foster Substation; Town of Patterson/Town of Southeast. We will be rebuilding it to replace aging infrastructure as well as to new electric standards.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, is it similar to what just went on taking the lines and putting the poles in along Route 6 to the substation at the train station?

Mr. Kopansky: The MTA project? Yes, it will be similar to that. I don't know that the poles will be taller. Gideon, what are your thoughts on that? I don't know if he's there. I don't believe that the poles will be taller.

Chairman LaPerch: Your gentleman has his mic off. My question here is: we had a situation after the fact, someone in the Town of Southeast wasn't aware that new poles were being put in along the NYSEG right-of-way and was pretty upset with the height of them and the fact that the area was cut beyond what should have been. Is there any public notification to any property owners that this will occur?

Mr. Reinhart: I'm the public outreach assistant for NYSEG. The answer to your question sir is yes, we have created a project fact sheet, which will show the line coming through. It will also let the folks know which roads will and/or may be impacted directly with access points and/or indirectly through truck traffic. With that fact sheet we have a landowner letter prepared that we will send out to everyone two months in advance and that gives them the fact sheet as I mentioned and also gives them a project contact number which comes directly to myself, the project manager, and the field construction manager so we can address any potential questions or concerns before we would get to a point that those residents experienced previously.

Mr. Kopansky: Just so everyone's aware, the vegetation management has already taken place on the right-of-way so there will not be any additional tree clearing.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, this is a Wetland Permit application. I see that our Town Wetland Consultant said that he was thinking you could move the start date back. What are your thoughts on that... to July?

Mr. Oppong-Darko: Starting in July will be fine but we just wanted to finish the project this year and that is why we wanted to start but July should be fine.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, that's fine with us then. Ms. Eckardt any questions?

Boardmember Eckardt: Yes, thank you. One of the major problems with the last project was the poles by Beechers, I know we were told but I'd love to see what would illustrate it better, if anything (inaudible) because that was a real surprise to a lot of people. Of course residents of Brewster might be the ones who are very upset because I don't know if any lines will be blocking views or anything. I am concerned about our residents.

Chairman LaPerch: Could everyone hear her comments because it was a little broken up?

NYSEG, did you hear her concerns?

Mr. Oppong-Darko: Could you please repeat the question?

Chairman LaPerch: Did you hear her concerns?

Mr. Oppong-Darko: Yes.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you. OK, any other questions Lynne?

Boardmember Eckardt: No, that's my major concern.

Chairman LaPerch: Mr. King any questions?

Boardmember King: No questions.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you, Mr. Armstrong?

Boardmember Armstrong: Is the reason for the poles being replaced because of conditions or age

of the poles or is it a larger cable, more capacity? I'm just curious what the reason is.

Mr. Oppong-Darko: All the reasons you mentioned are part of it. The lines are very old, aging infrastructure. Currently the lines cannot carry enough load so we are going to rebuild it more resilient, allow more current to go through, and so it is all of the above.

Boardmember Armstrong: Thank you, you've answered my question. **Chairman LaPerch:** Thank you Mr. Armstrong. Mr. Cyprus any questions?

Boardmember Cyprus: Yes, what Scott said before, the letter that you referenced that's going to go to every landowner in the entire three-mile stretch?

Mr. Reinhart: Yes sir, that's correct. Everyone that will be directly affected and also indirectly affected. We have a buffer that we put out: anyone within 500 ft. of that line that would be indirectly affected we will send those letters out to all of the above folks.

Ms. Ley: Can that letter be included with your Public Hearing notice?

Mr. Reinhart: Yes and I apologize, due to the circumstances I wasn't able to get on my computer this evening due to our security and firewall. That letter is prepared. I was going to share that with you this evening so if I can get an email from someone as a contact, I can share that letter with you as soon as tonight or tomorrow morning.

Ms. Desidero: Just send it to planning@southeast-ny.gov.

Mr. Reinhart: OK, I'll send it.

Boardmember Cyprus: Are the poles being replaced in the same spot or are they going next to the existing pole first and they might end up closer to someone? How are you replacing the poles? **Mr. Oppong-Darko:** The poles will be in the same right-of-way. They will be away a distance and there will be fewer poles than we currently have.

Boardmember Cyprus: I apologize, I didn't really hear that. The new pole will be potentially how far away from the existing pole?

Mr. Oppong-Darko: They will be almost in the same place except for a few instances where they are 2-3 inches away from the current one.

Chairman LaPerch: Any other questions? If not, I have three action items.

Boardmember Rush: You forgot me. **Chairman LaPerch:** I am sorry.

Boardmember Rush: It's on the coat-tails of Eric's question: what I have witnessed when they have put in these new poles... they put them literally right next to the old pole where you now have two poles because they don't want to disturb any of the infrastructure from the old pole. So, my concern is a bunch of double poles all over the Town because of this methodology or are they planning to remove them and transfer them at some later date that we don't know about.

Mr. Oppong-Darko: The old poles will be removed immediately and disposed of.

Boardmember Rush: So there will only be one pole; where there is one now, you're adding a new one and removing the old one?

Mr. Oppong-Darko: Yes, we will remove the old pole. Only the new one will remain.

Boardmember Rush: In every case? **Mr. Oppong-Darko:** Yes, in every case.

Boardmember Rush: OK, so if we see double poles we'll know.

Mr. Oppong-Darko: All the old poles will be replaced. There will be no old poles left there. **Boardmember Rush:** I have double poles right now out in front of my house, that's why I'm asking.

Mr. Oppong-Darko: No, that won't happen on this project. **Chairman LaPerch:** OK, any other questions Mr. Rush?

Boardmember Rush: No sir, all yours.

Chairman LaPerch: Good stuff, thank you David.

The motion to Declare Intent to be Lead Agency was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed with a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. The motion to set a Public Hearing for April 27, 2020 was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Eckardt and passed all in favor.

Chairman LaPerch: We are referring to the Town of Patterson why? **Ms. Ley:** Because the project extends over the Town line and into Patterson.

The motion to refer to County Planning under GML-239m and the Town of Patterson was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Rush and passed all in favor.

4. AT&T, **3925 Danbury Road**, **Tax Map ID 69.13-1-20** – Review of an Application for Site Plan Amendment. Alec Gladd of Cuddy & Fedder, LLP represented this application with Chris Basso who is the ATT&T Site Acquisition person.

Chairman LaPerch: You are here to extend the pole from 110 to 120?

Mr. Gladd: OK, so yes, we're here for actually a 20 ft. extension. I believe what you are referring to is the prior approval that T-Mobile got back in 2011 to 2012 I think it was, but they actually never built what they were approved to 100 ft. so the existing height of the pole right now is 100 ft. This is the site at 3925 Danbury Road. I believe there is a small auto body shop or automotive property. It's near the border with Connecticut and if on I84 it's right by the "I Love New York" sign. Verizon maintains an existing facility here and as I noted the monopole is 100 ft. and AT&T is proposing to extend it 20 ft. to 120 ft. All of AT&T's support equipment on the ground will be placed within the existing fenced compound so there is no expansion or work outside of the existing footprint. AT&T will be maintaining the field monopole design so it will look essentially the same as it does now, just 20 ft. taller. Also, importantly T-Mobile still reserves that space at 107 ft. that they previously got approved for, which is important under your Code because if there are three carriers on a pole it's allowed up to 120 ft. so no ZBA variances are required for what AT&T is proposing. Included within our application packet we also submitted a structural analysis showing that the monopole can support the proposed 20 ft. extension. We also included an MPU report which shows that the RF emissions are well, well below what the SEC deems safe and that looks at the AT&T antenna and also the Verizon antenna. This site is going to be a 5G site and it's also a First Net site which AT&T provides priority to first responders and other emergency services. Given the minor nature in that there is no compound expansion we're asking that it be deemed minor under the Code and also that this Board waive any other Public Hearing or other requirements for approval.

Chairman LaPerch: Ashley, I have a question: why is there a motion here to refer to the ARB? **Ms. Ley:** Because it is extending the height of this structure and I do note that this plan does say that there is a proposed expansion of the compound. I don't know if everyone can see the red dot? **Chairman LaPerch:** I see that. Is there a footprint change here?

Mr. Gladd: For this application for the pole we have no intention of expanding the compound beyond how it is currently configured.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, if that's the case I don't see why we are sending it to the ARB for an expansion of 20 ft. but that's my opinion. Ms. Eckardt, any questions?

Boardmember Eckardt: None right now. thanks Tom.

Chairman LaPerch: Mr. King any questions?

Boardmember King: No questions.

Chairman LaPerch: Mr. Armstrong any questions?

Boardmember Armstrong: When these towers started being installed the Board was concerned when they are no longer used like when the technology moves on that they be removed. There was a provision that they be removed within a certain period of time. I just want to be sure that in the Final Resolution if it is not in the Ordinance that it is in the actual permit that when these towers are no longer being utilized that they be removed within a certain period of time. I don't remember if it was a Zoning Ordinance oR if it was unique with each approval.

Ms. Ley: It is in the Zoning Ordinance as a requirement.

Chairman LaPerch: Good question Dan, thank you. Mr. Cyprus please.

Boardmember Cyprus: Nothing Tom.

Chairman LaPerch: Thank you sir. Mr. Rush, any questions?

Boardmember Rush: Yes, I just want a clarification really. So, there's no expansion. The new

proposed expansion of the area is not happening?

Mr. Gladd: I missed that.

Boardmember Rush: Yes, you have on your plan that we're looking at a proposed 30kw diesel generator on a new pad: is that not happening now?

Mr. Gladd: For the present, no.

Boardmember Rush: OK, so are these drawings going to be amended before they're approved, you know the scope that we're saying these things aren't happening. I don't want to approve something and not have it happen.

Mr. Basso: Absolutely. I think there might be some confusion here. Most assuredly I do have and I will provide Alec with a revised drawing that indeed shows it will be absent of the generator. It will be clearly absent of any proposed expansion beyond what you see with the proposed tower extension that we do need.

Boardmember Rush: My only other question is Tom, 120 ft. the max., right Ashley?

Ms. Ley: Yes, that is the maximum.

Boardmember Rush: OK, no other questions.

Chairman LaPerch: OK, thank you very much. If there are no further questions, I have four actions.

The motion to Classify this application as a Type II Action and a Town of Southeast Minor Project was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 with 1 absent. The motion to refer this application to County Planning on a GML-239m was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Cyprus and passed all in favor.

Chairman LaPerch: Public Hearing, do I have any comments about a Public Hearing. Do we typically hold Public Hearings on these cell towers?

Ms. Ley: If it was a brand new one, yes, but most of the cell towers we've seen recently have just been changing out.

The motion to Waive the Public Hearing was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor.

Chairman LaPerch: Ashley, why are we referring this to the ARB?

Ms. Ley: So, it is a Site Plan Amendment. The Board does have the ability to waive referrals to the ARB for minor Site Plan Amendments. This one does involve the change of a structure, but it is going to look substantially the same, just a little bit taller.

Chairman LaPerch: Comments please?

Boardmember Rush: As long as there is no expansion to the existing facility and just an

extension of the pole, I'm OK with waiving the Public Hearing.

Chairman LaPerch: Any other comments please?

Boardmember Cyprus: I agree with David.

The motion to Waive the Referral to the Architectural Review Board was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Rush and passed all in favor.

Ms. Ley: I just want to go over the next steps on AT&T. The only reason this couldn't have been approved in one night aside from the issues with the mistakes on the drawings is that it needs to go to County Planning. So, you can file for Final Site Plan and be on the agenda for probably the April 27 agenda if you file everything in time.

The motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes from February 24, 2020 as written was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Armstrong and passed all in favor.

The motion to close the meeting was introduced by Chairman LaPerch, seconded by Boardmember Rush and passed all in favor.

April 3, 2020/CC/VAD

THE FULL AUDIO/VIDEO RECORDING OF THIS MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT:

https://www.southeast-ny.gov/337/Planning-Board-Audio-Files